

REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the outstanding Action. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to further set forth the application, and claims 11-18 have been added to depend from allowed claim 4. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are now pending and submitted for consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is noted with appreciation that claim 4 has been allowed for the reasons set forth in item 11 of the outstanding Action.

Claim Objection

Claim 10 is objected to as containing certain informalities.

In response, claim 1 from which claim 10 depends has been amended to address the concerns as set forth in item 2 of the outstanding Action. Particularly, the phrase relating to the second occurrence of “opening” is deleted from claim 1 to address the indefiniteness concern with respect to claim 10.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sakakibara* (Japanese Patent Document No. 04-27487).

Claim 1 as amended specifically recites “a diffusing plate disposed between the light guide plate and the non-light emitting display device for uniform distribution of light from the light source”. On the other hand, ***Sakakibara*** does not even disclose any diffusing plate, much less a diffusing plate disposed between a light guide plate and non-light emitting display device for the uniform distribution of light from a light source (see page 8 of the specification and Fig. 1).

Therefore, the present application as now set forth in amended claim 1 from which claims 2, 6, 9 and 10 depends is allowable over ***Sakakibara***, which does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element or limitation as now set forth in claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 10.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okajima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,993, hereinafter "*Okajima*").

It is respectfully submitted that ***Okajima*** also does not disclose, teach or suggest any diffusing plate disposed between a light guide plate and non-light emitting display device, and therefore amended claim 1 from which claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 10 depend would also distinguish over ***Okajima*** for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okajima* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nagakubo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,891, hereinafter "*Nagakubo*").

Nagakubo has been previously discussed and is again cited for compensating the acknowledged deficiency in with respect to a reflecting surface and a back surface of a predetermined shape for controlling light reflection. However, since claims 5 and 9 depend from claim 1, and they are also allowable over *Okajima* and *Nagakubo* for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okajima* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,704,703, hereinafter "*Yamada*").

Yamada has been previously discussed and is again cited for compensating the acknowledged deficiency in with respect to a reflector with protrusions. However, since claim 9 depends from claim 1, and it is also allowable over *Okajima* and *Yamada* for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okajima* as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Kim* (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,175).

Kim has also been previously discussed and is again cited for compensating the acknowledged deficiency in with respect to a light source holding part. However, since

claim 6 depends from claim 1, and it is also allowable over **Okajima** and **Yamada** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.


* * * * *

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit claims 4 and 11-18 are now in condition for allowance, and that each of claims 1-3 and 5-10 now recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. Applicants therefore request that this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond J. Ho
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,838

Customer No.: 004372
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810
RJH:elz
TECH/205342.1